arXiv:1510.04185v1 [math.MG] 14 Oct 2015

Prestress Stability of Triangulated Convex Polytopes and Universal Second Order Rigidity

Robert Connelly and Steven J. Gortler

October 15, 2015

Abstract

We prove that universal second-order rigidity implies universal prestress stability and that triangulated convex polytopes in three-space (with holes appropriately positioned) are prestress stable.

Keywords: rigidity, prestress stability, universal rigidity

1 Introduction

A classic result of Cauchy [5] implies that the boundary of any convex polytope in 3-space is rigid, when each of its natural 2-dimensional faces is held rigid, even though they are allowed to rotate along common edges like hinges. In [15], Dehn proved that a polytope with triangular faces is infinitesimally rigid, and therefore rigid, when the edges are regarded as fixed length bars connected to its vertices. A. D. Alexandrov [2] showed that any convex triangulated polytope, where the natural surface may consist of non triangular faces, is still infinitesimally rigid, as long as the vertices of the triangulation are not in the relative interior of the natural faces. Connelly [6] proved that any convex triangulated polytope in 3-space is second-order rigid, no matter where the vertices of the triangulation are positioned, and second-order rigidity implies rigidity in general. The only trouble with this last result is that second-order rigidity is a very weak property. A stronger property, which we will now discuss, is called prestress stability.

When a framework is constructed with physical bars, if it rigid but not infinitesimally rigid, it is often called "shaky" in the engineering literature [14]. For such a rigid, but not infinitesimally rigid, framework, if the each of bars is at its natural rest length, then the framework can deform significantly under external forces [13]. But in some situations, this shakiness can be rectified by placing some of the bars in either tension or compression. When successful, the resulting structure will be at a local minimum of an internal energy functional that can be verified using the *second derivative test*. such structures will not deform greatly under external forces, even though they are infinitesimally flexible. Thus, the stiffness of a physical framework ultimately depends not just on the geometry, but also on the physical properties and tensional states of the material.

With this in mind, a (geometric) bar framework is called *prestress stable* if there exists a way to place its bars in tension or compression so that the resulting structure is at a local minimum of an internal energy functional that can be verified using the *second derivative test*.

In this paper, (Theorem 9) we show that any arbitrarily triangulated convex polytope in 3-space, is in fact prestress stable. Indeed, extending the results of [8], we show that there are many ways of positioning holes in the faces of the polytope so that any resulting triangulation of the surface is prestress stable. Our condition is that for each face F of the polytope, there is another convex polytope P_F projecting orthogonally onto F, with F as the bottom face, such that each hole of F is the projection of an upper face of P_F, as in Figure 1. Furthermore, for any triangulation of P, minus the holes, we assume that the boundary of each face F is infinitesimally rigid in the plane of F.

As part of obtaining this result, we first show (Corollary 1) that, in general, if any bar framework is universally second-order rigid in the sense that it remains second-order rigid when thought of as a (degenerate) framework in all higher dimensions, then it must be prestress stable in its original and all higher dimensions. This result is also related to the problem of characterizing when a semi-definite feasibility problem has a singularity degree of exactly one [17].

Some of these ideas were briefly sketched in the survey [8], but have not previously been given a complete and formal treatment.



Figure 1: The green faces in the convex polytope project onto the yellow holes in the base face. The rest of the bottom face minus the yellow holes can be triangulated at will.

2 Definitions and Background

Let $(G, \mathbf{p})$, denote a (bar and joint) framework where $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{p_n})$ is a configuration of n points $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and G is a corresponding graph, with n vertices and with e edges connecting some pairs of points of $\mathbf{p}$.

2.1 Local Rigidity

Here we define a sequence of local rigidity properties.

We start with the most basic idea defining a rigid structure. We say that the framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is *locally rigid* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if, except for congruences, there are no continuous motions in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of the configuration $\mathbf{p}(t)$, for $t \geq 0$, that preserve the distance constraints:

$$|\mathbf{p}_i(t) - \mathbf{p}_j(t)| = |\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j| \tag{1}$$

for all edges, $\{i, j\}$, of G, where $\mathbf{p}(0) = \mathbf{p}$. By a congruence, we mean that $\mathbf{p}(t)$ is simply the restriction of an isometry of $\mathbb{R}^d$ to the vertices.

The simplest way to confirm that a framework is locally rigid is look at the linearization of the problem.

A *first-order flex* or *infinitesimal flex* of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a corresponding assignment of vectors $\mathbf{p}' = (\mathbf{p}'_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}'_n)$, $\mathbf{p}'_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for each $\{i, j\}$, an edge of G, the following holds:

$$(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j) \quad = \quad 0 \tag{2}$$

The *rigidity matrix* $R(\mathbf{p})$ is the nd-by-e matrix, where

$$R(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{p}' = (\dots, (\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j), \dots)^T,$$

for $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, and we write $R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = R(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) = R(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{q}$ for any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, which we call the *rigidity form* for the graph G in $\mathbb{R}^d$. With this, equation (2) can be rewritten as,

$$R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}') \;=\; 0 \tag{3}$$

A first-order flex $\mathbf{p}'$ is *trivial* if it is the restriction to the vertices, of the time-zero derivative of a smooth motion of isometries of $\mathbb{R}^d$. This is equivalent to there being a d-by-d skew symmetric matrix A and a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\mathbf{p}'_i = A\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{b} \tag{4}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note that the property of being trivial is independent of the graph G.

A framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is called *infinitesimally rigid* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if it has no infinitesimal flexes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ except for trivial ones.

A classical theorem [13] states:

Theorem 1. *If a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it is locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

The converse of the theorem is false, so there is room for weaker conditions that can be used to certify local rigidity. One such notion is called prestress stability. The rough idea is to look for an energy function on configurations for which $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is a local minimum.

To this end we define an *equilibrium stress* for a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ to be an assignment of a scalar $\omega_{ij} = \omega_{ji}$ to each edge $\{i, j\}$ of the graph G, such that for each vertex i of G,

$$\sum_j \omega_{ij}(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) = 0, \tag{5}$$

where the non-edges of the stress $\omega = (\dots, \omega_{ij}, \dots)$ have zero stress.

We say that a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is *prestress stable* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if there is an equilibrium stress ω for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ such that for every non-trivial first-order flex

$\mathbf{p}'$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of $(G, \mathbf{p})$, we have $\sum_{i<j} \omega_{ij}(\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j)^2 > 0$. From this definition it is clear that if a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then, using the all-zero stress, it is automatically prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The following is shown in [13].

Theorem 2. *If a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it is locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

It is also shown in [13] that this definition of prestress stability coincides with the motivating property, described above in the introduction. This means that there is an energy for which $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is a minimum that can be verified with the second derivative test. In this correspondence, the coefficients, ω_{ij}, correspond to the first derivative of the energy of the associated bar with respect to changes in its squared-length.

The converse of Theorem 2 is again false, so there is room for even weaker conditions that can be used to certify local rigidity. One such notion, used in [6] to study the rigidity of triangulated convex polytopes, is second-order rigidity. The idea is motivated by looking at the first two derivatives of some proposed continuous flex of the framework.

A *second-order flex* of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a corresponding assignment of vectors $\mathbf{p}' = (\mathbf{p}'_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}'_n)$, $\mathbf{p}'_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $(\mathbf{p}''_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}''_n)$, $\mathbf{p}''_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for each $\{i, j\}$ an edge of G the following hold:

$$(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j) = 0 \tag{6}$$

$$(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{p}''_i - \mathbf{p}''_j) + (\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j)^2 = 0. \tag{7}$$

Using the rigidity matrix define above, the equations (6) and (7) can be rewritten as:

$$R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}') = 0 \tag{8}$$

$$R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}'') + R(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}') = 0. \tag{9}$$

We say that $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is *second-order rigid* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if there is no second-order flex $(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$ of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, with $\mathbf{p}'$ non-trivial as a first-order flex.

The following is proven in [6].

Theorem 3. *If a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is second-order rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it is locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Second-order rigidity is a natural property, but it has some practical difficulties, which can be seen with a dual formulation [13].

Theorem 4. *A framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is second-order rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if and only if for every non-trivial first-order flex $\mathbf{p}'$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of $(G, \mathbf{p})$, there is an equilibrium stress ω such that $\sum_{i<j} \omega_{ij}(\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j)^2 > 0$.*

From this it is clear that if a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it is second-order rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$. But in second-order rigidity, it can happen that no one stress *blocks* (has positive energy on) all non-trivial first-order flexes. Rather one can think of there being a "demon" living in the framework that senses any particular non-trivial first-order flex $\mathbf{p}'$ and blocks it.

Putting these together, we can summarize the state of affairs as in [13]:

Theorem 5. *Infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ implies prestress stability in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which implies second-order rigidity in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which implies locally rigidity in $\mathbb{R}^d$. None of these implications reverse. (See Figure 2.)*



Figure 2: Nested space of d-dimensional local rigidity properties of frameworks. This paper shows that triangulated polytopes are not only second-order rigid in $\mathbb{R}^3$, but are also prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Remark 1. *There are significant difficulties in attempting to define a meaningful notion of third-order rigidity [12].*

One of the two main results of this paper (Theorem 9) is that a triangulated convex polytope in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is not only second-order rigid in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (a result of [6]) but is in fact prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Remark 2. *A framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is called* globally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^d$ *if, there are no other other (even distant) frameworks $(G, \mathbf{q})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ having the same edge lengths as $(G, \mathbf{p})$, other than congruent frameworks. Congruence means that there is an isometry of all of $\mathbb{R}^d$ that takes $\mathbf{q}$ to $\mathbf{p}$. This is a much stronger property than local rigidity, but we will see in the next section that the global/local distinction vanishes in unconstrained dimensions.*

2.2 Universal Rigidity

In order to study the prestress stability in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of triangulated convex polytopes, and indeed for its own sake as well, we study what happens when we regard our d-dimensional framework as realized (degenerately) in $\mathbb{R}^D \supset \mathbb{R}^d$ for arbitrarily large D. It is easy to see that we do not need to take D to be any larger than $n-1$, where n is the number of the vertices of G, but we use the symbol D instead of n to emphasize that this denotes a number of spatial dimensions. This then brings up the notion of universal rigidity.

Given a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ with a d-dimensional span, but realized in in $\mathbb{R}^D$, we define the notions of *universal local rigidity*, *universal second-order rigidity* and *universal prestress stability* as respectively, local rigidity, second-order rigidity and prestress stability in $\mathbb{R}^D$. (If $d < n-1$, then a framework with a d-dimensional span can never be infinitesimally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^D$, and so there is no need to define universal infinitesimal rigidity).

These three properties naturally inherit the inclusion relations of the previous section: universal prestress stability implies universal second-order rigidity which implies universal local rigidity. Though it is not clear, a-priori, if any of these implications reverse. In this paper we will conclude that in fact universal prestress stability is no different than universal second-order rigidity, (but that these are stronger properties than universal local rigidity).

Remark 3. *It turns out that there is no need to define a separate notion of universal global rigidity, as it is immediately implied by universal local rigidity[7, 9]. Thus we henceforth drop the "local" qualifier from the term*

universal rigidity. This makes universal rigidity a very strong property indeed, that, for example implies global rigidity in $\mathbb{R}^d$.



Figure 3: Nested space of local, global, and various universal rigidity properties of frameworks. This paper shows that universal second-order rigidity is the same as universal prestress stability. The relationship between the properties shown here to those of Figure 2 are not obvious, other than the fact that universal prestress stability implies prestress stability in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The property of universal prestress stability is actually the same as another property called *super stability*, which we now describe.

For an equilibrium stress $\omega = (\dots, \omega_{ij}, \dots)$ for a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ we define the *stress energy* as

$$E_\omega(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i<j} \omega_{ij}(\mathbf{q}_i - \mathbf{q}_j)^2,$$

which is a quadratic form on the configuration space $\mathbb{R}^{nD}$. The matrix of E_ω with respect to the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{nD}$ is $I^D \otimes \Omega$. The matrix Ω, called the *equilibrium stress matrix* corresponding to the equilibrium stress ω, is defined as the symmetric $n \times n$ matrix whose i, j entry is $-\omega_{ij}$, when $i \neq j$,

and is such that all row and column sums are zero. The energy E_ω is positive semidefinite (PSD) if and only if Ω is a PSD matrix.

Let L be an affine linear subspace of some Euclidean space. We say that a set of lines $\{L_1, \ldots, L_m\} \subset L$, lie on a *conic at infinity* for L if, regarding the lines in L as points in a corresponding real projective space, they all lie on a conic in that space. It turns out that if there is an affine motion of the framework that is not a congruence, while preserving the lengths of edges that are parallel to one of the lines $\{L_1, \ldots, L_m\}$, then the projective points must lie on a conic at infinity.

Following [7] we say a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is *super stable* if there is an equilibrium stress ω for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ such that its associated stress matrix Ω is PSD, the rank of Ω is $n - d - 1$, where d is the dimension of the affine span $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$ of $\mathbf{p}$, and the edge directions do not lie on a conic at infinity in $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$.

To relate super stability to universal prestress stability, note that the ω from super stability blocks *any* non-zero vector $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^{nD}$, except those that arise from an affine images of $\mathbf{p}$. Moreover, those affine images cannot contain any non-trivial first-order flexes by the assumption that the edge directions do not lie on a conic at infinity. In particular:

Theorem 6. *The framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is super stable if and only if it is universally prestress stable.*

In this paper, our first main result (Corollary 1) will be that If $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is universally second-order rigid then it is universally prestress stable.

Since it is known that there are frameworks that are universally rigid but not super stable [9], this completely describes the relationship between these properties. See Figure 3.

3 Farkas

Our proofs will rely on some simple properties of closed convex cones.

Definition 1. *Let Y be a closed convex cone in $\mathbb{R}^m$, for some m. Its dual cone Y^* is defined as $\{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \langle \omega, \mathbf{y} \rangle \geq 0, \ \forall \mathbf{y} \in Y\}$, where $<,>$ is the usual inner product. Note that $\operatorname{int}(Y^*)$ consists of the ω such that $\langle \omega, \mathbf{y} \rangle > 0$ for all non-zero $\mathbf{y}$ in Y.*

We start with the following fairly standard Farkas duality lemma. The proof here is based on [19]; we include it here for completeness.

Lemma 1. *Let Y be a closed convex cone in a finite dimensional real space. Let L be a linear space with $Y \cap L = 0$. Then there is an element $\omega \in L^\perp$ such that $\omega \in \text{int}(Y^*)$.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive: Suppose there is no such interior element ω. Then $L^\perp$ is disjoint from the interior of Y^*. Thus there is a "supporting" hyperplane Z^* for Y^* such that $Z^* \supset L^\perp$.

To see this we note that $\text{int}(Y^*)$ is convex and is disjoint from $L^\perp$. Thus we can use the weak separation theorem to find a hyperplane Z^* (through the origin), that weakly separates $L^\perp$ from $\text{int}(Y^*)$ and thus from Y^*. This Z^* is a supporting hyperplane for Y^*. Meanwhile, since $L^\perp$ is linear, it must be contained in Z^*.

We can associate with the supporting hyperplane $Z^* =: \mathbf{y}^\perp$ a non-zero dual linear functional (ie. a primal vector), $\mathbf{y}$, such that $\langle Y^*, \mathbf{y}\rangle \geq 0$. Thus by definition of a dual cone, $\mathbf{y} \in (Y^*)^* = cl(Y) = Y$. Also we must have $\mathbf{y} \in L$. Thus $Y \cap L \neq 0$. □

4 Universal second-order rigidity

We are interested in universal second-order rigidity, but it will be helpful to look at the case where some subset of the vertices are pinned to first-order.

Definition 2. *Given framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^D$. Let G_0 be a subset of the vertices of G. We regard $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ as the framework, where the vertices in G_0 are pinned "to first order" as described next.*

We say that $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ is pinned universally second-order rigid if there is no second-order flex $(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$ of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^D$, with $\mathbf{p}'$ non-trivial as a first-order flex in $\mathbb{R}^D$ and with $\mathbf{p}'_j = 0$ when $\mathbf{p}_j$ corresponds to a vertex in G_0. Note that there is no pinning constraint imposed on $\mathbf{p}''$.

We should be careful to realize that we assume the "pinned" vertices are only pinned to the first-order. For example, Figure 4 is not pinned universally second-order rigid, when the indicated vertices are pinned only to the first-order. In this example, there is a $\mathbf{p}'$ moving the central vertex orthogonal to the plane in three-space, and there is a corresponding $\mathbf{p}''$ of the pinned vertices pointing towards the central vertex. When bars (even subdivided bars) are inserted between the first-order pinned vertices, then the framework becomes pinned universally second-order rigid.



Figure 4: This framework is not universally second-order rigid when the outer three vertices are only pinned to first order.

Definition 3. *Given a graph G, a dimension d, and a chosen subset of "pinned" vertices G_0 we define*

$$\mathcal{C}'(d, G_0) := \{\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^{nd} \mid \mathbf{p}'_j = 0, \forall\, \mathbf{p}_j \text{ corresponding to vertices in } G_0\}.$$

Definition 4. *Given a framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$. Let*

$$Y := \{R(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}') \mid \mathbf{p}' \in \mathcal{C}'(D, G_0)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^e$$

where $R(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the rigidity form for the graph G, and D is sufficiently large.

Let L be the linear space defined as the linear span of the columns of $R(\mathbf{p})$, the rigidity matrix.

Lemma 2. *Y is a closed convex cone.*

Proof. Let Y_1 be the set $\{R(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}') \mid \mathbf{p}' \in \mathcal{C}'(1, G_0)\}$. The set Y_1 is a cone. Since in higher dimensions $R(\cdot, \cdot)$ acts by summing over each of the dimensions, and D is sufficiently large, we find that $Y = Hull(Y_1)$. Thus Y is a convex cone.

Since G is connected, $R(\cdot, \cdot)$ acts properly on $\mathcal{C}'(D, G_0)$, thus Y is closed. □

Lemma 3. *Suppose that the vertices of G_0 in $\mathbf{p}$ have an affine span that agrees with the span of $\mathbf{p}$. Let $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ be pinned universally second-order rigid. Then there is no non-trivial intersection of L and Y.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbf{y}$ was some non-trivial intersection point. Since $\mathbf{y} \in L$, then we have $\mathbf{y} = -R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}'')$ for some $\mathbf{p}''$. Since $\mathbf{y} \in Y$, then we have

$\mathbf{y} = R(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}')$ for some non-zero $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathcal{C}'(D, G_0)$. Since D is a sufficiently large dimension, we can, without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbf{p}'$ lies completely in dimensions that are orthogonal to the d-dimensional span of $\mathbf{p}$. Thus $\mathbf{p}'$ is a first-order flex for $(G, \mathbf{p})$. Since $\mathbf{p}'$ is non zero, but is zero on a set of vertices with a full affine span, then this flex is non-trivial in $\mathbb{R}^D$. Thus $(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$ is a non-trivial second-order flex. This contradicts the assumed pinned universal second-order rigidity. □

Lemma 4. *Any $\omega \in L^\perp$ is an equilibrium stress vector for $(G, \mathbf{p})$. Any $\omega \in \text{int}(Y^*)$ must correspond to an Ω that is positive definite on $\mathcal{C}'(1, G_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. The vector ω must be in the cokernel of $R(\mathbf{p})$ and thus must be an equilibrium stress vector for $(G, \mathbf{p})$. Any $\omega \in \text{int}(Y^*)$ has the property that for any non-zero $\mathbf{p}' \in \mathcal{C}'(D, G_0)$ we have $\sum_{i<j} \omega_{ij}(\mathbf{p}'_i - \mathbf{p}'_j)^2 > 0$. □

Theorem 7. *Let $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ be pinned universally second-order rigid. Then it must have an equilibrium stress Ω is positive definite on $\mathcal{C}'(1, G_0)$.*

Proof. This follows immediately using Lemmas 3, 2, 1, and 4. □

We can now obtain our first main result about (unpinned) universal second-order rigidity.

Corollary 1. *If $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is universally second-order rigid and has a d-dimensional span. Then it must have an equilibrium stress matrix Ω that is positive semidefinite (acting on $\mathbb{R}^n$) and of rank $n - d - 1$. Thus it must be super stable/universally prestress stable.*

Proof. Pick any subset of $d + 1$ vertices with a full d dimensional affine span in the configuration $\mathbf{p}$ to be the subset G_0. If $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is universally second-order rigid, then $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ must be pinned universally second-order rigid. From our theorem it must have an equilibrium stress Ω that is positive definite on $\mathcal{C}'(1, G_0)$. Since G_0 is of size $d+1$, then Ω must have rank at least $n - d - 1$, and as this is maximal, it must have rank equal to $n - d - 1$, and also must be positive semidefinite.

Since it is universally second-order rigid, it must have no non-trivial flexes, so it cannot have its edge on a conic at infinity. □

4.1 Generalizations

There are few directions for generalizing Corollary 1.

A d-dimensional framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is called *dimensionally rigid* if there is no other equivalent framework with an affine span of dimension greater than d [3]. If a framework is dimensionally but not universally rigid, then it is not locally rigid in $\mathbb{R}^D$, but all other equivalent frameworks can be obtained from $\mathbf{p}$, through the restrictions of an affine transform acting on $\mathbb{R}^D$. (The edge directions of $(G, \mathbf{p})$ lie on a conic at infinity). Like universal rigidity, dimensional rigidity can often be certified by a single PSD equilibrium stress matrix Ω of rank $n - d - 1$ but such a single-matrix certification does not always exist.

It is easy to see that Corollary 1 also provides a characterization when such a single certification of dimensional rigidity exists. Suppose that in all dimensions, there are no second-order flexes other than those where $\mathbf{p}'$ arises from an affine transform of $\mathbf{p}$. Then following the proof of the corollary, we pick any subset of $d + 1$ vertices with a full d dimensional affine span in the configuration $\mathbf{p}$ to be a subset G_0. Then $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ will be pinned universally second-order rigid, and duality will give us our desired Ω.

We can also consider a general PSD feasibility problem [17]

$$F := \{X \in S^n_+ : M(X) = b\}$$

where S^n_+ is the cone of positive semidefinite n-by-n matrices and M is a linear mapping from S^n to $\mathbb{R}^e$, for some e. Let r be the highest rank among the solution set F, obtained, say, by some solution X_0. If $r = n$, this problem has a positive definite feasible solution, and we say that the problem has a singularity degree of zero.

Suppose that $r < n$, then (due to a Farkas duality) it must have a (dual) PSD matrix Ω such that $\langle \Omega, X \rangle = 0$ for all $\{X : M(X) = b\}$. If we can find such an Ω of rank $n - r$, then we say that the problem has a singularity degree of one. The pair, (X_0, Ω), forms a certificate that the maximal rank for this problem is indeed r.

Otherwise, the singularity degree is higher, and can be found by appropriately iterating the above process, called facial reduction [4, 9]. Higher singularity degrees can result in numerical instability.

Corollary 1 gives a characterization for singularity degree one, when M corresponds to computing the squared edge length measurement over the edges of a graph G, given the Gram matrix of a configuration $\mathbf{p}$. (Here r would correspond with $d+1$). Can we generalize this to get a characterization for a general SDP feasibility problem to have singularity degree one?

Indeed, most of the ideas generalize very naturally. Let us begin with the appropriate generalization to Equation (9). Suppose we can factor $X_0 = P^tP$, where P is a rank r, n-by-n matrix.

The analogue of the linear space $R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}'')$, where $\mathbf{p}''$ is allowed to be any configuration, is then $M(P^tP'' + (P'')^tP)$. where P'' is allowed to be any n-by-n matrix. Interestingly, the space spanned by $P^tP'' + (P'')^tP$ is, in fact, $tan(X_0, S^n_+)$, the tangent to S^n_+ at X_0 (see [21] for definitions). And thus our analogous linear space is $M(tan(X_0, S^n_+))$. The analogue to an equillibrium stress vector is a vector $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^e$ such that $M^*(\omega)P = 0$, where M^* is the adjoint mapping back up into S^n.

The analogue to the cone $R(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}')$ is $M(\bar{F}_0)$, where $\bar{F}_0$, is any face of S^n_+ that includes a matrix of rank $n-r$, and has no non-trivial intersection with F_0, the face of X_0.

Putting this together, we would like to say that if the constructed linear space has only the trivial intersection with the constructed cone, then our problem has singularity degree one. The main obstacle to completing this argument is the fact that in the general case, $M(\bar{F}_0)$, need not be closed. and the Farkas Lemma 1 need not apply.

5 Triangulated convex polygons with holes

We have two goals for this section and the next. One goal is to prove that arbitrary triangulations of certain polyhedral spaces are universally rigid, with some of the vertices pinned to first order. Another goal is to prove that arbitrary triangulations of certain polyhedral spaces are prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^3$. These two goals are closely related.

A motivating example for the first goal is when the polyhedral space is the underlying space of an embedded simplicial complex where some of its vertices are pinned to the first-order. But the space must satisfy certain geometric conditions. For example, a two-dimensional convex planar polygon with its boundary vertices pinned to first order, and some "holes" removed from its interior, will be universally second-order rigid under any triangulation, if the holes are placed correctly. Figure 5(a) is a case when the holes are properly placed, whereas in Figure 5(b) the holes are not properly placed.

Definition 5. *Following [18] a* polyhedron $X = |K|$ *is the underlying space of a simplicial complex K in some Euclidean space and K is called a triangulation of X. If X is a polyhedron, with a subpolyhedron $X_0 \subset X$, we*



Figure 5: When the corner vertices of Figure (a) are pinned, and any triangulation of the blue two dimensional polyhedron is taken, the framework is super stable. For Figure (b) there is a triangulation that is a finite mechanism in 3-space.

say that (X, X_0) *is a* spider set *if for every point* $\mathbf{x} \in X - X_0$*, there is a framework* $(Sp, \mathbf{q})$ *with* $\mathbf{x}$ *a vertex of* $\mathbf{q}$*, whose edges lie in* X*, and there is an equilibrium stress that is positive on all the edges with at least one vertex in* $X - X_0$ *(and no zero length edges). We call* $(Sp, \mathbf{q})$ *a* spider tensegrity *corresponding to* $\mathbf{x}$ *and the spider set* (X, X_0)

Note that a polyhedron is allowed to be of "mixed dimension".

The definition of a spider set does not depend on a particular triangulation. For example, when a polyhedral set X is a subset of a convex planar polygon F, with X_0 the boundary of the polygon, the question as to whether it is a spider set can be determined by considering the infamous Maxwell-Cremona correspondence as discussed in [8] and shown in Figure 1. Suppose that P_F, a convex polytope, projects, orthogonally by the projection π, onto the polygon F which coincides with the "bottom" two dimensional face of P_F. Let $P_F^{(1)}$ be the one-skeleton of P_F. Let X consist of the projection $\pi(P_F^{(1)})$ and the projection of any chosen subset of the two-dimensional top faces of P_F. Then such an (X, X_0) must be a spider set. To see this, if $\mathbf{x}$ is the projection of a vertex of P_F, then the projection of the one-skeleton serves as the spider tensegrity for X. If $\mathbf{x}$ is the projection of a point in the relative interior of one of the faces of P_F, it is easy to lift that point slightly above the convex hull of the other vertices, adjusting the polytope P_F. If $\mathbf{x}$ is the projection of a point in the relative interior of an edge of P_F, it is easy to adjust the stress to accommodate the subdivided edge.

Theorem 8. *Let (K, K_0) be any triangulation of a spider set (X, X_0) and $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ the corresponding framework of the one-skeleton of (K, K_0), where G_0 corresponds to those vertices of G that are in X_0. Then $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ is universally second-order rigid when the vertices of G_0 are pinned to the first-order.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{p}_1$ be any vertex of $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$, not in G_0. By the definition of a spider set, there is a spider tensegrity $(Sp, \mathbf{q})$ of (X, X_0), where $\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{p}_1$ is a vertex in that tensegrity and $(Sp, \mathbf{q})$ has an equilibrium stress ω, positive on all the edges with at least one vertex in $X - X_0$. Let $(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$ be a second-order flex of $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$, where $\mathbf{p}'_j = 0$ for vertices in G_0. We will show that $\mathbf{p}'_1 = 0$. Applying this to all the vertices of G not in G_0 will show our result.

For any simplex σ of K and edge τ of the tensegrity $(Sp, \mathbf{q})$, the sets $\sigma \cap \tau$, that are non-empty, provide a subdivision of the edges of $(Sp, \mathbf{q})$ say $(\overline{Sp}, \mathbf{r})$. The second-order flex of $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ extends naturally to a corresponding second-order flex of each of the simplices of K, and in particular to the segments $\sigma \cap \tau$. Thus there is a corresponding second-order flex $(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}'')$ of $(\overline{Sp}, \mathbf{r})$, where $\mathbf{p}'_1 = \mathbf{q}'_1 = \mathbf{r}'_1$, say and $\mathbf{r}'_j = 0$ for $\mathbf{r}_j \in X_0$. Similarly there is a corresponding equilibrium stress $\bar{\omega}$ for $(\overline{Sp}, \mathbf{r})$, that is positive on all the edges in $X - X_0$. Then for the rigidity matrix $R(\mathbf{r})$ for $(\overline{Sp}, \mathbf{r})$, we have $\bar{\omega} R(\mathbf{r}) = 0$, by the equilibrium condition. This gives us the contradiction:

$$0 = \bar{\omega} R(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{r}'' + \bar{\omega} R(\mathbf{r}') \mathbf{r}' = \sum_{i<j} \bar{\omega}_{ij} (\mathbf{r}'_i - \mathbf{r}'_j)^2 > 0,$$

unless $\mathbf{p}'_1 = \mathbf{q}'_1 = \mathbf{r}'_1 = 0$. □

Note that even when the spider set is a triangle with its vertices pinned, there are triangulations of the interior that are not spiderwebs, as shown in the classic twisted example in Figure 6a from [10]. The rigidifying stress must be negative on some of the internal edges. Figure 6b shows how the spider construction in the proof of Theorem 8 would work for the center vertex of Figure 6a.

Together with Theorem 7, this gives us the following:

Corollary 2. *Let (K, K_0) be any triangulation of a spider set (X, X_0) and $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ the corresponding framework of its one-skeleton, where G_0 corresponds to those vertices of G that are in X_0. Then $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ must have an equilibrium stress ω such that the energy, E_ω, is positive definite away from G_0.*



Figure 6: (a) The set X is a single triangle and X_0 is its boundary. The framework $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ is the one skeleton of a triangulation (K, K_0) of (X, X_0). (b) The outer three edges and the subdivided dashed edges form a subdivided spider framework $(\overline{Sp}, \mathbf{r})$, of (X, X_0) corresponding the center vertex.

Remark 4. *The existence result of Corollary 2 is somewhat related to the notion of a discrete Laplacian operator [24]. In that setting, given a triangulation of a polygon F in $\mathbb{R}^2$ (which need not even be convex), one looks for a vector $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^e$ with the property that E_ω is positive away from the boundary vertices, and that for all* internal *vertices (not on the polygon boundary) we have $\sum_{j \in N(i)} \omega_{ij}(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j) = 0$. Such an ω acts an equilibrium stress for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ under that added assumption that all of the boundary vertices are fully pinned to all orders. Under these weaker requirements, there exist well known constructive approaches for generating such an ω.*

One such construction uses the so called "cotangent" weights [22], which assigns $\omega_{ij} := \cot(\theta_{ij}) + \cot(\theta_{ji})$ to each internal edge (see Figure 7). Depending on the geometry of the triangulation, some of these weights may be negative. They derive this energy in the context to a Dirichlet energy computation. There is also another derivation for the cotangent weights that uses Heron's formula for the area of a triangle, the law of sines and the law of cosines. See [16], for example. But when the polygon F has more than three vertices, this construction cannot be used to generate an ω that is in equilibrium at the boundary vertices.

A related question is if a "random" set of holes is put in a membrane with



Figure 7: The cotangent construction assigns $\omega_{ij} := \cot(\theta_{ij}) + \cot(\theta_{ji})$ to each internal edge.

its boundary clamped, is there a critical threshold with a "phase change" where the membrane becomes not rigid in $\mathbb{R}^3$? It turns out for the continuous case [11] and the triangulated case [20], the answer is no. With high probability the membrane will have some flexible parts.

6 Triangulated convex polytopes with holes

We now wish to consider a convex polytope P in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and a bar framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$, where all the vertices and bars are contained in the two-dimensional boundary surface of P.

Definition 6. *Let P be a convex polytope in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Let $P^{(1)}$ be the underlying point set of the one-skeleton of P. Let H be a polyhedral subset of the boundary surface of P. We say that H is holeyhedron if the following properties hold for every (two-dimensional) face F of P:*

(a) The one-skeleton $P^{(1)} \subset H$.

(b) Any infinitesimal flex in the plane of F of any triangulation of $H \cap F$ is trivial on vertices that are in $P^{(1)} \cap F$.

(c) The polyhedron $(H \cap F, P^{(1)} \cap F)$ is a spider set.

The following is a slight generalization of [6] Theorem 5.2 using Definition 6(b).

Lemma 5. *Let $(G, \mathbf{p})$ be the bar framework of a triangulation of a holeyhedron. Let $\mathbf{p}'$ be a first order flex in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Then $\mathbf{p}'$, when restricted to vertices in $P^{(1)}$, is a trivial first-order flex.*

We now state our second main result of this paper.

Theorem 9. *Any triangulation $(G, \mathbf{p})$ of a holeyhedron, H, is prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^3$.*

Proof. From Corollary 2, we have for each triangulated $F \cap H$ of our face an $\omega(F)$ such that $E_{\omega(F)}$ is positive definite on all vectors that vanish on $P^{(1)} \cap F$. By simply adding together all of these $\omega(F)$, we obtain an ω that is an equilibrium stress for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ and must be positive definite on any vector $\mathbf{p}' = (\mathbf{p}'_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}'_n)$ that vanishes on $P^{(1)}$.

Meanwhile, from Lemma 5, all first-order flexes $\mathbf{p}'$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ have $\mathbf{p}'$ trivial on $P^{(1)}$. By adding an appropriate trivial flex to $\mathbf{p}'$ we can make $\mathbf{p}'$ vanish on $P^{(1)}$. In light of equation (4), this addition will not change $E_\omega(\mathbf{p}')$, as Ω is an equilibrium stress matrix for $\mathbf{p}$. Thus, if $\mathbf{p}'$ is any non-trivial first-order flex of triangulation, we have $E_\omega(\mathbf{p}') > 0$, making the triangulation $(G, \mathbf{p})$ of H prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^3$. □

7 Extensions and related results

If one considers only polyhedral subsets H of the boundary of a convex polytope P in three-space, where one is allowed to triangulate H at will, then it is important, for each face, F, that no hole have a vertex on the interior of any of the natural edges of P, (although there can be holes that touch the natural vertices). For example, Figure 24 of [6] is a tetrahedron with a small slit on one face touching the relative interior of one edge that can be subdivided and flexed as a finite mechanism to be flat in the plane. See also [1] for methods for decreasing the size of the slit.

In more detail, suppose one vertex $\mathbf{x}$ of one of the holes of H lies on a natural edge of the polytope. And suppose the interval $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$ is part of the boundary of that hole, interior to its face in P, as in Figure 8. Then any vertex on the interior interval $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$ cannot be part of a spider tensegrity, because of the positivity requirement on the equilibrium stress for all interior edges. (Recall that when all edges lie on one side of an interval, then those strictly on one side must have zero stress). This positivity is required by Definition 6c.



Figure 8: Any vertex of a subdivision of face on the interval between the points **x** and **y**, as shown, cannot be part of a spider tensegrity. All the edges adjacent to the middle vertex must have zero stress.

Alternatively, suppose the surface H has a hole with an edge that coincides with a natural edge of the polytope. Then when that edge is subdivided (which is allowed in a triangulation of H), then this triangulation of the set $H \cap F$ will not have the first-order rigidity property of Definition 6b.

With the above comments in mind it seems that if an arbitrary triangulation of a polyhedral subset of the surface of a convex polytope P is prestress stable, each natural edge e of P must have at least a small "flange" that lies in each side of e in each of the two adjacent faces so that e is in the topological interior relative to the two dimensional surface, as in Figure 5(a).

7.1 Prestressed fixed frameworks

We can extend the notion of a spider tensegrity as in Definition 5 to say that a framework $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ is a *spider tensegrity* if there is an equilibrium stress for $(G, \mathbf{p})$ that is positive on all the edges with at least one vertex in $G - G_0$.

If one is given a fixed bar (or tensegrity) framework, we can use some of the techniques described previously to generate prestress stable structures as follows:

Corollary 3. *Suppose a bar framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is such that the there are vertices G_0 of G such that $(G, G_0, \mathbf{p})$ is a spider tensegrity, and G_0 is*

contained in a subgraph G_1 of G such that $(G_1, \mathbf{q})$ is first-order rigid, with $\mathbf{q}$ corresponding to the vertices of G_1. Then $(G, \mathbf{p})$ is prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Note that the framework $(G, \mathbf{p})$ above may not be first-order rigid as is the case for Figure 9b, but the boundary is part of the framework in Figure 9a, which is first-order rigid in the plane.



Figure 9

Corollary 4. *If each face F of a convex polytope in $\mathbb{R}^3$ contains a spider tensegrity such that the vertices on each boundary of F are first-order rigid in the plane of F, as in Corollary 3, then the union of these spider tensegrities is prestress stable in $\mathbb{R}^3$.*

One may apply the Roth-Whiteley criterion [23] for the first-order rigidity of tensegrity frameworks to the framework in Figure 9a. Namely that the underlying bar framework is first-order rigid, and there is an equilibrium stress, positive on all the cables, and negative on all the struts.

References

[1] Zachary Abel, Robert Connelly, Erik D. Demaine, Martin Demaine, Thomas Hull, Anna Lubiw, and Tomohiro Tachi. Rigid flattening of polyhedra with slits. In *Abstracts from the 6th International Meeting on Origami in Science, Mathematics and Education (OSME 2014)*, page to appear, Tokyo, Japan, August 10–13 2014.

[2] A. D. Alexandrov. *Convex polyhedra*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Translated from the 1950 Russian edition by N. S. Dairbekov, S. S. Kutateladze and A. B. Sossinsky, With comments and bibliography by V. A. Zalgaller and appendices by L. A. Shor and Yu. A. Volkov.

[3] Abdo Y. Alfakih. On dimensional rigidity of bar-and-joint frameworks. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 155(10):1244–1253, 2007.

[4] Jon M. Borwein and Henry Wolkowicz. Facial reduction for a cone-convex programming problem. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 30(3):369–380, 1980/81.

[5] Augutin Louis Cauchy. Sur les polygones et polyèdres. *second mémoire, Journal de l'Ecole Polytechnique*, 19:87–98, 1813.

[6] Robert Connelly. The rigidity of certain cabled frameworks and the second-order rigidity of arbitrarily triangulated convex surfaces. *Adv. in Math.*, 37(3):272–299, 1980.

[7] Robert Connelly. Rigidity and energy. *Invent. Math.*, 66(1):11–33, 1982.

[8] Robert Connelly. Rigidity. In *Handbook of convex geometry, Vol. A, B*, pages 223–271. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1993.

[9] Robert Connelly and Steven J. Gortler. Iterative Universal Rigidity. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 53(4):847–877, 2015.

[10] Robert Connelly and David W. Henderson. A convex 3-complex not simplicially isomorphic to a strictly convex complex. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 88(2):299–306, 1980.

[11] Robert Connelly, Konstantin Rybnikov, and Stanislav Volkov. Percolation of the loss of tension in an infinite triangular lattice. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 105(1-2):143–171, 2001.

[12] Robert Connelly and Herman Servatius. Higher-order rigidity—what is the proper definition? *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 11(2):193–200, 1994.

[13] Robert Connelly and Walter Whiteley. Second-order rigidity and prestress stability for tensegrity frameworks. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 9(3):453–491, 1996.

[14] Henry Crapo and Walter Whiteley. Statics of frameworks and motions of panel structures, a projective geometric introduction. *Structural Topology*, (6):43–82, 1982. With a French translation.

[15] M. Dehn. Über die Starrheit konvexer Polyeder. *Math. Ann.*, 77(4):466–473, 1916.

[16] Mathieu Desbrun, Mark Meyer, Peter Schröder, and Alan H Barr. Implicit fairing of irregular meshes using diffusion and curvature flow. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, pages 317–324. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1999.

[17] D. Drusvyatskiy, G. Pataki, and H. Wolkowicz. Coordinate shadows of semi-definite and euclidean distance matrices. *SIAM Journal on Optimization, Vol 25, No 2, 1160–1178*, 25(2):1160–1178, 2015.

[18] J. F. P. Hudson. *Piecewise linear topology*. University of Chicago Lecture Notes prepared with the assistance of J. L. Shaneson and J. Lees. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1969.

[19] L. Lovász. Semidefinite programs and combinatorial optimization. *Lecture Notes*, 2006.

[20] M. V. Menshikov, K. A. Rybnikov, and S. E. Volkov. The loss of tension in an infinite membrane with holes distributed according to a Poisson law. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 34(2):292–312, 2002.

[21] Gábor Pataki. Strong duality in conic linear programming: facial reduction and extended duals. *arXiv:1301.7717v3*, 2009.

[22] Ulrich Pinkall and Konrad Polthier. Computing discrete minimal surfaces and their conjugates. *Experiment. Math.*, 2(1):15–36, 1993.

[23] B. Roth and W. Whiteley. Tensegrity frameworks. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 265(2):419–446, 1981.

[24] Max Wardetzky, Saurabh Mathur, Felix Kälberer, and Eitan Grinspun. Discrete laplace operators: no free lunch. In *Symposium on Geometry processing*, pages 33–37, 2007.